



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/537,373	06/03/2005	Philippe Guenebaud	0518-1153	5001

466 7590 03/12/2010
YOUNG & THOMPSON
209 Madison Street
Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER

PYZOCHA, MICHAEL J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2437

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

03/12/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DocketingDept@young-thompson.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/537,373	Applicant(s) GUENEBAUD, PHILIPPE	
	Examiner MICHAEL PYZOSHA	Art Unit 2437	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 June 2005 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/3/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Preliminary amendment filed 06/03/2005 has been received and considered.
2. Claims 1-25 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement filed 06/03/2005 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein, which has been lined through, has not been considered; the remaining references (e.g. U.S. Patents Documents) have been considered.

Specification

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.
- (e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A

COMPACT DISC.

(f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.

(1) Field of the Invention.

(2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.

(g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.

(h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).

(i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.

(j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).

(k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).

(l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

Drawings

4. Figures 1 and 2 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated as described in the specification pages 5 and 6 by use of the phrase "current state of the art". See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

7. Claims 1 and 9 recite the phrases "can be connected" and "able to be connected"; it is unclear whether they are physically connected or not which renders the claim indefinite because if they are not connected it is unclear how the streams transmitted.

8. Claims 1 and 16 recites the phrase "it includes" but it is unclear to what "it" is referring. In these claim the "it" could be referring to the host or the processing module. For the purpose of examination it will be assumed that the "it" recited in these claims (and their dependents) refers to the processing module.

9. Claim 3 recites the limitation "the decryption" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

10. Claims 17 and 22 recite the limitation "the treated signal" in lines 9 and 3 respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim because not signals are being "treated".

11. Any claims not specifically addressed are rejected by virtue of their dependencies.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2437

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 1-4, 6-15, 17-21 and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US 7418059) in view of Szucs et al. (US 20030135730).

As per claims 1, 9 and 17, Lee discloses receiving at least one input transport stream (see column 3 lines 38-39) of encoded digital data in a predetermined compression format; decoding the digital signals contained in the input transport stream (see column 3 lines 43-49 where the signals must have been encoded by the compression format in order to be decoded).

Lee discloses that the digital signals processing unit (i.e. board 11) is a part of the host system and therefore fails to disclose the digital signals processing unit is connected to the host and the module returns treated signals to the host.

However, Szucs et al. teaches a digital signals processing module is connected to a host which receives signals, processes them and returns them to the host (see paragraphs [0068] and [0071] where the receiver is the host and the CA module is the digital signals processor).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to separate the digital signals processing module from the host in the Lee system.

Motivation, as recognized by one of ordinary skill in the art, to do so would have been to allow the module to be easily changed also this combination further increases

Art Unit: 2437

security of descrambled content by encrypting the content between devices (see Szucs et al. paragraph [0042]).

As per claims, 2, 3, 15 and 19, the modified Lee and Szucs et al. system discloses means for descrambling (see Szucs et al. paragraph [0071] “descrambler 15”), authorizing decrypting (see Szucs et al. paragraph [0071] last two lines) and encrypting the digital signals (see Szucs et al. paragraph [0068]).

As per claims 4 and 18, the modified Lee and Szucs et al. system discloses the demultiplexing and filtering of the data input stream take place before decoding (see Lee column 3 lines 38-49).

As per claims 6, 13, 14, 20, 21, 23 and 24, the modified Lee and Szucs et al. system discloses a storage medium for storing the data signals (see Szucs et al. paragraphs [0135]-[0145]).

As per claims 7 and 10-12, the modified Lee and Szucs et al. system discloses an interface between the module and the host (see Szucs et al. paragraphs [0068], [0071] and [0133]).

As per claim 8, the modified Lee and Szucs et al. system discloses the data stream is audiovisual programs (see Lee column 3 lines 38-49 and Szucs et al. paragraph [0064]).

As per claim 25, the modified Lee and Szucs et al. system discloses at least one additional processing module is used, decoding is carried out from different compression formats in the various processing modules (see Lee column 3 lines 38-49 the video and audio decoders).

Art Unit: 2437

14. Claims 5 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Lee and Szucs et al. system as applied to claims 1 and 20 above, and further in view of Callway (US 20030202006).

As per claims 5 and 22, the modified Lee and Szucs et al. system fails to disclose encoding the decoded signals into at least another compression formation.

However, Callway teaches such re-encoding (see paragraph [0039]).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to re-encode the decoded signals of the modified Lee and Szucs et al. system.

Motivation to do so would have been to change the coding to a code that will be understood by the end device (see Callway paragraph [0039]).

15. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Lee and Szucs et al. system as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Ho (US 6622307).

As per claim 16, the modified Lee and Szucs et al. system fails to include a digital/analog converter connected to the module for additional processing of analog signals.

However, Ho teaches a digital/analog converter in use with a digital signal processor (see column 8 lines 51-64).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a digital/analog converter in the modified Lee and Szucs et al. system.

Motivation, as recognized by one of ordinary skill in the art, to do so would have been to process the data into a format correct for output.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL PYZOCHA whose telephone number is (571)272-3875. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:00am - 3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/537,373
Art Unit: 2437

Page 9

/Michael Pyzocha/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2437